

REMARKS

Amendment to the Claims

In the present Amendment, independent Claims 1, 12, 13 and 14 have each been amended to incorporate the subject matter of each of Claims 3 and 4. Claims 2-4 have been canceled.

No new matter has been added, and entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested. After entry of the Amendment, Claims 1 and 5-14 will be pending.

Response to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 & 103

Referring to paragraph no. 3 at page 2 of the Office Action, Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,096,088 (“Yu”).

Referring to paragraph no. 5 at page 3 of the Office Action, Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,816,820 (“Friedl”).

Referring to paragraph no. 8 at page 3 of the Office Action, Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yu or Friedl in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,454,973 (“Norton”).

Applicants traverse and respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider in view of the amendment to the claims and the following remarks.

The independent claims of the present claimed invention recite *at least* the following two novel and non-obvious features:

- (1) The purpose is to obtain a molding condition in which weld line occurrence in a molding can be suppressed or controlled; and
- (2) An area in which weld line occurrence is intended to be suppressed or controlled is divided into a plurality of areas and a weighting weld line occurrence quantity in the plurality of

the areas is used as a weld line evaluation value, thereby inducing weld line occurrence into a specified area or avoiding weld line occurrence in a specified area.

In contrast, Yu, Friedl and Norton, alone or in combination, do not disclose or fairly suggest either feature (1) or feature (2) of the present claimed invention. Even if the references did disclose these two features of the present claimed invention (which they do not), the Examiner has failed to articulate an adequate rationale for combining the prior art to attain the claimed invention. Thus, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the Sections 102 & 103 rejections of Claims 1-14 based on Yu, Friedl and Norton.

Conclusion

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael G. Raucci
Registration No. 61,444

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 1, 2008